

From: William Warner
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/23/02 1:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To: The United States Department of Justice
Re: Proposed Final Judgement in United States v. Microsoft

I have read numerous newspaper articles and web pages regarding the PFJ, most notably the DOJ's web site and Dan Kegel's web site. I am an electrical engineer writing software for a large wireless company with eight years experience in the field. I am a consumer of software for personal computers, some from Microsoft, some from other vendors, and some free and open source.

First, I want to endorse Mr. Kegel's open letter to the DOJ.

<http://www.kegel.com/remedy/letter.html>

I agree with Mr. Kegel in that the PFJ is too narrow and technical to limit Microsoft's anti-competitive practices.

Second, let me describe how Microsoft harms me, the consumer and citizen, and what the results of a Microsoft penalty should be.

Microsoft prevents me from buying quality software. While Microsoft has some desirable products, such as its desktop office suite, there are many that are both inferior and expensive, such as its personal internet information server. By forcing OEM into exclusive contracts, Microsoft prevents them from competing with one another to deliver the best software package to me. I would like to buy a computer with the Microsoft Office suite and the apache web server (which is free, secure, efficient and scalable) preinstalled and configured, and I am sure that major manufacturers like Dell and Compaq would offer this combination if they could, as it's a combination frequently deployed by individuals and corporations.

Microsoft prevents developers from producing quality software. In a competitive market place, software developers should win by giving consumers the most value. The fact that Microsoft applications only run on run on Microsoft Windows is a sign that the software market is less than competitive, since in a competitive market their application market would expand if applications were "ported" to other platforms. This is harmful to me, the consumer, in that it prevents me from choosing the best platform on which to run a selected Microsoft application. Likewise, it prevents developers from creating applications that run on the Microsoft platform.

Finally, Microsoft weakens the national information infrastructure. While

I credit Microsoft for making computers affordable and accessible to consumers, and hence creating a good deal of the information infrastructure, their anti-competitive practices have shielded them from the market forces that would naturally result in better software for everyone. The "nimda" computer worm is an excellent example. It was not a subtle bug in Microsoft's web server, it was more like an invitation to vandals, and it is costing individuals and their internet providers many millions of dollars. I am certain that this overlooked security hole would have been found and secured in a competitive software market. As it is, we all suffer as a result of Microsoft's arrogance.

Thank you for your consideration.

William Warner
Seattle, Washington
wwarner@yahoo.com